

REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action mailed on May 23, 2008. Since this Amendment is being filed within the three month shortened statutory period for response, which expires on August 23, 2008, no extension of time or other fees are believed to be due, except as detailed in the attached documents. However, any extension of time necessary to prevent abandonment is hereby requested, and any fee necessary for consideration of this response is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account Number 502846 (Customer Number 36163).

Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1-20 will be pending in this application. Claim 1 has been amended to clarify the invention. Claim 2 has been amended to eliminate a typographical error. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-3, 8-11, and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,081,782 to Rabin ("Rabin") in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,289,226 to Lekven et al. ("Lekven"). Claims 4-7 and 12-14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rabin in view of Lekven and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication Number 2003/0139171 to Kuita ("Kuita"). The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Independent claim 1 requires that the central unit receive information from a microphone and determine if the information is a telephone number or a non-telephone number. Claim 1 also requires that a telephone number is prepared for display using a first format that includes at least one separation character. Claim 1 further requires that a non-telephone number is prepared for display using a second, different format that includes at least one separation character. Rabin does not teach these limitations of claim 1. Although the Examiner relies on Rabin to teach the concept of preparing non-telephone numbers for display, Rabin in fact does not teach preparing any numbers for display. The Examiner asserts that FIG. 6 shows non-telephone number information having been prepared for display. FIG. 6 shows the format of typical user records stored in database 113 of FIG. 1. Rabin, col. 7, lines 21-22. The reference is silent as to how even the telephone numbers are entered into the system for storage as shown in

FIG. 6, and there is no teaching or suggestion that the Rabin system considers the storage format shown in FIG. 6 a preparation for display.

Further, the only non-telephone numbers shown in FIG. 6 are user ID numbers created by the system. These ID numbers are not information received from the microphone. Rabin, col. 5, lines 59-62. Claim 1 requires that the non-telephone number be received as microphone information. Because the user ID numbers are created or assigned by the system and not received from a microphone, Rabin clearly fails to teach or render obvious this limitation of claim 1.

Furthermore, these user ID numbers are not stored with separation characters, let alone having been prepared for display using at least one separation character. Claim 1 requires that the non-telephone number information be prepared for display using at least one separation character, and Rabin fails to teach this limitation.

Additionally, claim 1 as amended requires the information includes a string of numbers and at least one word command if the information is a telephone number, where the word command assists in preparing the telephone number for display by indicating the location of the at least one separation character. While Rabin teaches the use of word-based voice commands, such as speaking the word "savings" in order to have the system retrieve and display a savings account balance, no teaching or suggestion in Rabin discloses the concept of using words to assist in preparing the telephone number for display where the word command is used to indicate the location of the at least one separation character in the telephone number format. While the telephone numbers in Rabin are shown as including at least one separation character in FIG. 6, Rabin is silent as to how those telephone numbers have been placed into the formatting shown in FIG. 6.

Lekven does not remedy the deficiencies of Rabin. Therefore, the combination of Rabin and Lekven does not teach all of the elements of claim 1, and independent claim 1 is patentable over the combination. As claims 2-9 depend from and include all of the limitations of independent claim 1, claims 2-9 are also patentable.

Independent claim 10 requires that numbers, including both telephone numbers and non-telephone numbers, be prepared for display by dividing the numbers into groups. Claim 10 also requires that the telephone groups be different from the non-telephone groups. As discussed above with respect to claim 1, Rabin does not teach preparing number information gathered by a microphone for display. Further, even if the user ID numbers shown in FIG. 6 could be considered to be numbers gathered by a microphone having been prepared for display, the user ID numbers have not been divided into groups as required by claim 10.

While applied to teach other limitations, Lekven also does not provide a teaching to divide non-telephone numbers into groups. Lekven teaches that telephone numbers may be prepared for display, but that non-telephone numbers are not to be prepared for display. Lekven in fact teaches away from applying a format to non-telephone numbers. Lekven teaches that applying formatting to a non-telephone number would prove to be confusing, so no format is to be applied to non-telephone numbers. See, Lekven, col. 1, lines 57-60, col. 6, lines 18-43, col. 7, lines 15-28, col. 8, lines 52-56.

Therefore, the combination of Rabin and Lekven does not teach all of the elements of claim 10, and independent claim 10 is patentable over the combination. As claims 11-15 depend from and include all of the limitations of independent claim 10, claims 11-15 are also patentable.

Claims 16, 17, and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent publication number 2003/0064748 to Stulberger (“Stulberger”) in view of Rabin. Claims 18 and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stulberger in view of Rabin and further in view of Kuita. The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Independent claim 16 requires that a hands free telephone system receive a dictated string of information and prepares that information for display by dividing and separating the information into at least two groups. The Examiner relies upon Rabin to teach these limitations. As discussed above, Rabin does not teach the concept of receiving information and preparing the information for display. Additionally, claim 16

Application No. 10/668,170
Amendment Dated August 25, 2008
Reply to Office Action of May 23, 2008

requires that the microphone of the HFT be disposed in the headliner. Stulberger teaches a cellular telephone with an HFT that is affixed to the steering wheel. Stulberger, FIG. 4 and paragraph [0018]. The combination of Stulberger and Rabin does not teach all of the limitations of independent claim 16, and claim 16 is patentable over the combination. Because claims 17-20 depend from and include all of the limitations of independent claim 16, claims 17-20 are also patentable over the combination of Stulberger and Rabin.

In view of the foregoing, all of the pending claims in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions or determine that any further action is desirable to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the Applicant's representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

PLUMSEA LAW GROUP, LLC

Date: August 25, 2008

By: /Michael S. Lee/

Michael S. Lee
Registration Number: 41,434
Telephone number: 301-365-9040